



Regional Airport Planning Committee

March 14, 2008

TO: Regional Airport Planning Committee
FROM: Staff of the Regional Airport Planning Committee

SUBJECT: Draft Minutes of January 25, 2008 Regional Airport Planning Committee Meeting

1. **Call to Order.** The meeting was called to order by Chair Garbarino at 9:35 A.M.
2. **Roll Call.** Present were: Garbarino (ABAG), Barrie (CalTrans), Blanchard (MTC), Chu (MTC), Gioia (Contra Costa County), Greene (SJC), Hauri (General Aviation), Hill (BAAQMD), McKenney (OAK), Novak (FAA), Salmon (ABAG), Martin (SFO), Spering (MTC) and Ward (ABAG).
3. **Staff Announcements.** None.
4. **Chair Announcements.** The Chair stated that staff sent out a list of meeting dates and asked the Committee to please hold these dates until staff tells the Committee which dates to release. He then stated that the next RAPC meeting would be held on March 28, 2008. Chair Garbarino announced that RAPC would like to welcome a delegation from the FAA and asked Rusty Chapman of the FAA to introduce the rest of our guests.

Rusty Chapman of the FAA introduced the delegation from the FAA and explained that they were visiting RAPC because the Bay Area is one of eight regions that will experience capacity shortfalls by 2015 and that the FAA was interested in working with the eight regions to address the projected shortfalls and was interested in learning more about the RAPC planning process and working with RAPC to find innovative solutions to address the shortfalls.

5. **Public Comment Period.** Michael Serabia provided the Committee with written comments and also spoke about concerns related to climate change and fighting forest fires.
6. **Minutes, Meeting Of January 25, 2008.** Motion was made to approve the minutes of RAPC's January 25, 2008 meeting. Motion passed unanimously.
7. **Presentations by General Aviation Airports (Agenda Item No. 4).** Chris Brittle introduced the General Aviation Airport managers and explained that the Committee would only hear from two of the three speakers today because Jon Stout from Charles Schulz Airport in Sonoma County was sick and unable to attend. He stated that the two managers that will present today

are Keith Freitas, Director of Airports for Contra Costa County and Carl Honaker, Director of Santa Clara County Airports.

Keith Freitas introduced Susan Bonilla, the Contra Costa County Supervisor for the 4th District who spoke about the importance of Buchanan Field in Concord and to the redevelopment of the Concord Naval Weapons Station. She explained that the community viewed Buchanan Field Airport as an asset and integral to the redevelopment of the Naval Weapons Station and that the community was open to the idea of commercial air service at the airport.

Keith Freitas followed up on Supervisor Bonilla's statements and presented information on operations and planning for Buchanan Field in Concord. In his presentation he said that Buchanan Field had room to grow, had commercial service in the past and was capable of resuming commercial service in the future, that the airport had adequate infrastructure to accommodate the likely demands for the airport and is in the process of adopting a Master Plan for the airport. He stated that the community supported commercial service at the airport and that there were no major land compatibility issues that they haven't been able to work through. He summed up his presentation by saying that Buchanan Field Airport was well positioned to add commercial service and has maintained the necessary certificate, is centrally located and could accommodate some regional service.

John Gioia echoed the comments of Supervisor Bonilla and said that it is important to note that there is a degree of community support for commercial air service at Buchanan Field.

Bill Ward stated that noise concerns are often a major issue with respect to airport operations and asked Mr. Freitas how noise was address in Concord.

Mr. Freitas responded that Buchanan Field has had a noise program for 20 years. Commercial air service and corporate jets are similar and we have seen corporate jets numbers triple. Working with pilots and neighbors to find compromises, noise complaints have dropped significantly in the last ten years. He explained that Buchanan worked with the FAA to re-route departures and have seen complaints drop 95 percent since that time.

Mr. Ward said that he represents the City of Hayward, which has a general aviation airport and that they are going through a master plan update process. He asked if it is important to find out what other airports are doing to inform this process.

Mr. Freitas said that it was important to learn from other airports. He said that the most important component in the consultant selection process for the master plan process was their plan for community outreach and that Buchanan had nine public outreach meetings and a 60-member steering committee to help with the update process.

Mr. Gioia said that a lot of discussion at RAPC has been about how to accommodate demand without filling the Bay with new runways and the idea of having GA airports serve as relievers for OAK and SFO is an important part of that. He stated that since the Bay Area to Los Angeles route is one of the busiest corridors in the Country, it would be useful to know what the market is from Contra Costa County and the Tri-Valley area to Los Angeles since this market would find Buchanan Field Airport more convenient than traveling to SFO or OAK.

Mr. Freitas responded that preliminary work done previously estimated that market to be 1.2 million.

Ms. McKenney stated that MTC conducts an air passenger survey on a semi-regular basis and that OAK recently worked with MTC on this survey and that the results could be provided to RAPC in a presentation or as a handout at a future meeting.

Mr. Freitas was asked what he contributed the community support for the airport to and he responded that it had a lot to do with the public process for the master plan update and the amount of work done with the steering committee. He explained that educating the community about what the growth would really look like was critical and that the steering committee will continue to function in some capacity after the plan is approved. He stated that several years ago, the support from the community wasn't there.

Mr. Chug asked what destinations were served when Buchanan Field had commercial service.

Mr. Freitas answered that there were five flights a day from Concord to Los Angeles and on to San Diego and three flights a day from Concord to San Jose. The flights to Southern California were conducted with 75 to 80 passenger planes and the San Jose flights were 15 to 20 passenger planes. He stated that they were not talking to carriers about reinstituting commercial service.

Mr. Gioia encouraged Buchanan Field representatives to start looking at noise abatement issues early and Mr. Freitas responded that Contra Costa County has a grandfathered noise abatement ordinance which restricts types of aircraft and that helps to keep noisier jets out of their airports. He gave an example about noise concerns by citing the experience of Denver where they received 2,000 complaints prior to moving the airport further from the population centers and 10,000 complaints after the move.

John Martin stated that marketing was important and that even SFO had to get in front of the planning staff at airlines and present the numbers to convince them to start service and that Charles Schulz Airport in Santa Rosa has done a very good job of marketing to the airlines.

Sam Salmon said that the presentation was eye opening to him and that finding out that the FAA would consider a change based on community concerns was surprising and would help him in working in Sonoma County on similar issues.

Carl Honaker the Director of Santa Clara County airports made the second presentation. His powerpoint presentation can be found at www.bcdc.ca.gov or www.mtc.ca.gov.

Public Comment for Item No. 4. Tim Woodburn a resident of Concord said that he lives two miles from the airport and that he has been an active participant in the master plan process and has gone from being wary of the process to supporting it. He explained that the airport has done a fantastic job of reaching out to the community and not only heard the community but addressed the community's concerns.

8. Report on Task Force Subcommittee (Agenda Item No. 5). Lindy Lowe reported that the task force subcommittee supported staff recommendations on the process and role of the subcommittee and made several recommendations regarding membership including the addition of two more members to represent environmental concerns. She concluded the report by explaining that staff is currently filling the seats for the task force, contacting members and identifying a date for an orientation meeting.

9. Brief Summary of Phase 3 Scope of Work (Agenda Item No. 6). Lindy Lowe presented the staff report on Phase 3 of RAPC's three-phase work program.

Ms. McKenney stated that RAPC had a good discussion at the last RAPC meeting regarding Phase 3 and that she thought some of that discussion is addressed in this report, but that it still misses a couple of points. She said that the statement that new runways were not currently a viable solution is not how the Oakland International Airport Master Plan described the issue.

She went on to state that the Master Plan concluded that because expansion at existing airports is challenging, the process that was conducted in 2000 was not sufficient to determine that new runways were the only or the best solution and this was true both from a technological and community consensus stand point and that a renewed RAPC effort was needed to go deeper and broader in those areas and should look at both runways and other solutions and come up with the right mix. She said that she wanted to see runways on equal footing with the other solutions that are being looked at in Phase 2 and that the way that this report is written it appears that runways are an inferior solution and that the other solutions are superior whether that means tripling service at Buchanan or constraining demand to half of what it wants to be in the Bay Area.

Ms. Lowe responded that it was not staff's intent to imply that runways are an inferior solution and that the report reflects the way that the original work plan was developed and how Phase 3 was described in that work plan. She described that the approach was to look at increasing capacity with existing infrastructure through new technology, institutional arrangements, demand management strategies other means and then look at using infrastructure at sites off of the three main commercial airports to meet excess demand and then only in Phase 3 would expanding infrastructure at either the commercial airport or at some other site be analyzed. She explained that if demand cannot be met any other way or could be met but much less efficiently or at a significantly greater cost, then new runways would be evaluated at either OAK or SFO.

Ms. McKenney stated that those are the caveats that should show up when describing the process and that you could meet demand by constraining demand and that might not be a good solution for the Bay Area.

Ms. Lowe responded that staff was hoping that through developing a regional consensus in Phase 2; we will discover how the region feels about constraining demand.

Ms. McKenney stated that RAPC needs to add a place where the costs and efficiencies of new runways at existing airports are compared with other solutions.

Mr. Chu said that coordination with the California High Speed Rail Authority should be expanded to include coordination with regional rail services and this should also be included in task force work.

Mr. Gioia asked if, when the report describes advocacy for changes to institutional arrangements whether that was a follow up to the discussion on regionalizing air services and cooperative planning.

Ms. Lowe responded that it was.

Public Comment for Item No. 6. John Foster of Fairfield spoke against civilian use of Travis Air Force Base and that he was concerned that including Travis in Phase 2 could shake up the biggest economic engine in Solano County and that he felt that the representative for Travis should be eliminated from the Task Force and that looking at Travis is inappropriate.

10. Report on Request for Qualifications for Phase 2. Chris Brittle presented the update on the Request for Proposals for selecting the Phase 2 consultant and reported that staff expects to have a consultant under contract by the end of March.

Mr. Ward asked about Moffett Field and if there was a community representative for the area on the Task Force. He also asked if it was expected that there would be a different response from the community than there has been in the past about using the airport for future aviation activity.

Mr. Brittle responded that there was a community representative for Moffett Field on the Task Force and that it will be looked at for all types of service. However, there was no reason to think that the community response would be different. He said that the Phase 2 process will identify demand for Moffett, but whether or not it could ever be realized is another question.

Mr. Chug responded that as a resident of Sunnyvale he could comment that when Google negotiated a contract to allow their private jet to land at Moffett Field there was a large uproar from the community. This experience is a good indicator of the community opinion of future air service at Moffett.

11. Proposal to amend the Memorandum of Understanding for RAPC to expand the membership of the Committee to include representatives from Stockton, Sacramento and Monterey airports. Joe LaClair presented a proposal to amend RAPC's MOU to include representatives from Stockton, Monterey and Sacramento Airports and asked the Committee for direction on the proposal. He introduced John Martin and asked him to present SFO's proposal on the amendment to the MOU.

Mr. Martin stated that the residents of Monterey and Stockton use Bay Area airports and a large majority of these residents end up flying out of SFO or OAK. He described that they are part of the Bay Area's catchment area and will be part of the solution. He stated that SFO's proposal is that elected officials from Monterey and San Joaquin Counties to represent these two airports should be invited to be members of RAPC. He said that he was not sure that Sacramento Airport fell into the same category as a much more mature airport and that the residents in Sacramento County used this airport rather than SFO or OAK.

Committee members agreed that amending the MOU was a good idea and directed staff to pursue it and to include Sacramento Airport.

12. Scheduling of Next Meeting, Adjournment. The next monthly meeting of RAPC will be held on March 28, 2008 at the MetroCenter Auditorium in Oakland.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:55 a.m.